



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,180	04/04/2005	Go Nagaya		5597
23373	7590	03/05/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			VANAMAN, FRANK BENNETT	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3618		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/05/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/530,180	Applicant(s) NAGAYA, GO
	Examiner Frank B. Vanaman	Art Unit 3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Status of Application

1. Applicant's amendment, filed Dec. 19, 2008, has been entered in the application.
Claims 1-6 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (US 3,472,331) in view of Iizuka et al. (US 5,224,563). Baker et al. teach an arrangement for the driving of a steerable wheel (42) including a first knuckle (122) which does not turn and is locked in a steering direction (e.g., at least through the connection at 124, 132, 134), and which is connected to an upper suspension arm (22), a lower suspension arm (24) and to a non-rotating vehicle portion and which supports, in a non-steered configuration, a drive assembly (12, 16), a second knuckle (19, 21, 82, 85) which is steerable, pivotally mounted with respect to the first knuckle about a king pin axis (Y), the arrangement additionally fitted with a braking arrangement (56, 58), wherein drive force is provided to the wheel hub through a mechanical arrangement including a flexible constant velocity joint (26) having a center (C) along the king pin axis (Y) and including two direct moving portions (e.g., 20 and 28) connected to one another by a pair of joint portions (orthogonal to one another) such that the axes of movement intersect at the center (C). The reference to Baker et al. fails to teach the drive source as comprising a motor. Iizuka et al. teach that it is well known to provide the steerable wheels of a vehicle (23, see top of figure 5) with drive motors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a motor drive as taught by Iizuka et al. for driving the wheels of the vehicle taught by Baker et al. with the non-moving portion of the motor connected to the non-steered portion of the vehicle frame (as also suggested by Iizuka et al.), for the purpose of reducing or eliminating emissions in city driving scenarios.

As regards the provision of a steering rod for rotating the steerable portions with respect to the non-steerable portions, in that (a) Baker et al. teach an arrangement for a steerable wheel and (b) it is very well known in the vehicle arts to connect a steering rod

to a pivoting wheel support to allow the wheel to be steered, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a steering rod connected a steerable portion (and as such to the second knuckle portion, as broadly claimed) in order to allow the wheel to be steered.

4. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. in view of Iizuka et al. and Nelson (US 3,468,389). The references to Baker et al. and Iizuka et al are discussed above and fail to teach the connection of the motor to the non-steered knuckle portion by an elastic body or damper, and 'direct-moving guides' in vertical and horizontal directions. Nelson teaches an old and well known arrangement for mounting a motor in a vehicle drive arrangement, wherein a motor (12) is mounted to non-steered portions of a vehicle (e.g., 62, 67) with plural resilient bushing elements (44, 46) and direct moving guide portions (50) being separately oriented in horizontal (58) and vertical (52) orientations and being provided with further resilient buffer members (36, 36, 37, 37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the mounting of the motor drive connected to the non-steered vehicle portions (and thus to the non-steered knuckle portion) of the vehicle of Baker et al. as modified by Iizuka et al. with the resilient and direct moving buffer and guide arrangement taught by Nelson, for the purpose of isolating the motor and frame so as to absorb torque reaction of the motor and cushion the motor from shocks and vibrations generated in the drive axle.

As regards claims 5 and 6, while the references to Baker and Iizuka teach universal joints (which may function as constant velocity joints for low angular values between input and output), the references do not explicitly teach the joints to be constant velocity joints. It is well known, however to employ a constant velocity joint in place of a universal joint for the well known purpose of keeping the incremental input and output velocities as close to one another as possible (rather than only the average velocity summed over a whole rotation as may be had with a universal joint).

Response to Comments

5. Applicant's comments, filed with the amendment, have been carefully considered. Applicant has asserted that Baker et al. fail to teach a first knuckle connected to upper and lower suspension arms. The examiner does not agree: Baker's element 122 may reasonably be interpreted as a knuckle, element 22 may be interpreted as an upper suspension arm and element 24 may be reasonably interpreted as a lower suspension arm, the elements being "connected" to the breadth applicant has recited the connection. The modified interpretation of Baker et al. is applied herein in direct response to applicant's amendment. Applicant has further argued that Baker et al. does not disclose or suggest "a knuckle that is divided into two parts". It is not clear how this limitation relates to the claim recitation, and in that there appears to be no basis in the claims for a limitation of the knuckle being "divided into two parts", the examiner understands that applicant is attempting to convince the examiner to read unrecited limitations into the claims, which is not proper for prosecution. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As regards reading unclaimed limitations from the specification into the claims

From MPEP 2111:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969) The court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from 'reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject

matter from the specification into the claim. See also *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Applicant has continued, asserting that the reference to Iizuka et al. fails to teach the element[s] which the reference to Baker et al. already teaches, it is not clear how this somehow moots the rejection, and applicant may desire to note that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Many of the difficulties encountered in the prosecution of patent applications may be alleviated if each applicant includes, at the soonest possible time, claims varying from the broadest to which he or she believes he or she is entitled to the most detailed that he or she is willing to accept.

Applicant should additionally be aware of the provision of 37 CFR 41.31, which states, in part:

"37 CFR 41.31 Appeal to Board.

(a) Who may appeal and how to file an appeal. (1) Every applicant, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the examiner to the Board by filing a notice of appeal accompanied by the fee set forth in § 41.20(b)(1) within the time period provided under § 1.134 of this title for reply."

Applicant's broad claims have been more than twice rejected, and as such, applicant is well in a position to appropriately file an appeal in this application.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new and/or modified ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3618

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry specifically concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Vanaman whose telephone number is 571-272-6701.

Any inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application may be made through either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,
Or faxed to:
PTO Central Fax: 571-273-8300

F. VANAMAN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3618

/Frank B Vanaman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3618